

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 1.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 12.

| \$1 50 in advance. |

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1824.

| \$2 at the end of the year. |

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At his new Office, No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

ILLUSTRATION.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 42.)

"And they were astonished at his doctrine."

Having shown in a former number of the TELESCOPE, that the multitude who attended on the ministry of the Redeemer, were astonished at the doctrine he taught; it is proper to suggest that the *latter*, though they were surprised at the doctrine of Christ, were not displeased with the instructions which he communicated. So far from this, we are informed by the Evangelist, that "the common people heard him gladly." These reflections naturally awake the inquiry, Why were they astonished at the doctrine of Christ? In the solution of this problem, *seven reasons* may be offered:

1. Because it was not in accordance with what they had been taught from early childhood. Had the Saviour's doctrine been the same with that in which they had before been instructed, no astonishment could have been produced thereby. For it was not the *manner* in which he *delivered* his sentiments, but the *sentiments themselves*, which awoke the astonishment of the listening multitude. They had long been amused with the subtle theories of their spiritual guides, and bowed with reverence to the opinions of their doctors. But when the great Teacher in Israel announced to them the important message of his Father's love, they saw the contrast, admired the vast difference which obtained between them, and listened with delight to the sweet enunciations of divine mercy. We shall cease to be surprised at their astonishment, if we indulge a brief comparison between the doctrine in which the multitude had been carefully educated, and that which was taught by the Saviour of the world.

Two systems of philosophy prevailed throughout the Gentile world, and were familiar to the Jews at that age. The *one* encouraged the gratification of every sensual appetite, as the means of certain enjoyment; while the *other*, verging to an opposite extreme, virtually denied the moral accountability of man by asserting that the gods, as well as men, were under the dominion of fate. The great Redeemer, in opposition to the Epicurian philosophy, inculcated the necessity of circumscribing the desires of man within the compass of reason and justice, and forbade the indulgence of human passions to the injury of ourselves or others; and even enjoined forbearance and love to our bitterest enemies. No un-

lawful gratification received the least countenance, either from his precepts or the example of his life.

The stoic, proud of his metaphysical research, paid a blind homage to fate, and an adoration superior to that which he offered to the intelligent Former of the Universe! While Christ inculcated the doctrine of one supreme intelligent Author of the world, to whom man was accountable for all his actions, whether good or evil.

The Essens, placed happiness in retirement and meditation, and encouraged a monkish seclusion from human society. But the illustrious founder of the new faith, strongly recommended social intercourse, and enjoined the faithful observance of all the social virtues, both by his example and by his doctrine.—He instructed his followers to let their light so shine before men, that others seeing their good works might glorify their Father who was in heaven; to do good unto all men; and to cultivate peace and friendship in the bosom of society. These duties could not be discharged in a state of seclusion from the world; which evinces the difference that obtained between the doctrine of the Essens, and that of Jesus.

The Scribes taught the multitude, that salvation, depended alone on a careful observance of the law, and might be secured by the labours and assiduity of the subject. The Saviour taught a doctrine totally different from this: he instructed the multitude that *salvation is of the Lord*, and that the work was to be effected by the *grace of God*: that no man could come unto him except he were drawn of the Father, and that when he should be *lifted up from the earth*, he would in due time *draw all men unto him*. In a word—that *eternal life* is the *gift of God* through him.

The Sadducees denied the resurrection of man, and consequently taught that there would be no future spiritual existence of the human family. Whereas Christ taught the eternity of man's existence in a glorious resurrection to immortality, and eternal life.

The Pharisees asserted that the sinner would be detained in an *everlasting prison* after the death of the body, and consequently be the subject of endless captivity and misery. The Saviour, however, declared himself appointed of God, to proclaim liberty to the captives; to open the prison doors to them that are bound; to lead out the prisoners, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house, and to comfort all that mourn.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

REV. MR. PICKERING,

Sir—It was not my intention to have given you any further trouble on the same subject as communicated in the 6th number of the Telescope; but as you have either mistaken my meaning, or are unable

to answer my reasons, I beg leave to address you once more, and again to inform you, that my reasons, stated in my former communication, were directed *exclusively* against that doctrine which teaches us that there are no rewards or punishments in a future state. Now, sir, if you do not advocate this sentiment, all you have to do is to say so, but in case you do contend for this sentiment, all that I can expect, is that evidence which has satisfied your mind on this all-important subject; for as to satisfactory proof, I do not expect any.

In my former communication, I confined myself to reason alone; and as I then took reason for my guide, expected that my objections would have been answered on the same ground; being with you persuaded, that scripture and reason are in perfect harmony. The reason that I did not before quote scripture in aid of my reasoning, was, because that I was aware that such a procedure might lead to a long controversy, as by quoting detached parts of scripture, almost any doctrine might be proved. Here perhaps I ought to stop, and wait your reply; but I must beg the liberty of offering a few remarks to your reply. You observe, "he adverts to the *rain and sunshine*, as a standing evidence adduced by the Universalists, in support of the divine impartiality, and then suggests that the future resurrection of the whole human family to a state of *eternal happiness*, would in his opinion, be making *Deity a partial being*." Here again, sir, permit me to say, you have mistaken my meaning. After contrasting the characters there alluded to, I then *ask*, whether reason dictates to us, that the state of those two characters will be the same in the eternal world, and if so, does it not prove that *Deity* is partial in regard to things in *time*? and if so, may we not from the same parity of reasoning, conclude that he will be equally partial with regard to blessings in the eternal world?

Here is a question that I expected you to answer, but the only answer that you have given, is, that the future resurrection of the whole human family to a state of *eternal happiness*, would, in *my* opinion, be making the Deity a partial being.

You were then pleased to call this very illogical reasoning; but as this reasoning appears to me to be perfectly compatible with that doctrine that teaches us there are rewards or punishments in the eternal world, I shall call it logical reasoning, until you can disprove the sentiment. You next observe, that "the blessings of a resurrection state are infinitely above the merits of our virtues, and therefore, can never be bestowed in consequence of any obedience rendered by the creature, to his Creator: what is purely the gift of God, and the gift by grace, should by no means be claimed as a reward of human merit." All this I admit; but cannot admit, that because the promises of God can never fail, that his threatenings will never be executed; or that all the punishment which is threatened as a consequence of

sin and transgression, will all be inflicted in this mortal state of existence. This is what I wished you to prove, in case you advocate this doctrine, and which is what I cannot admit, unless you can fairly substantiate the same, from scripture and reason. You next observe, that I have "associated two subjects which do not necessarily belong to my argument in favour of future punishment." This inference perhaps may be correct, if what you afterwards state, respecting an intermediate state, between the dissolution of the body, and the resurrection which you allude to, be true. You then say, "there may be, and doubtless is, an intermediate state between the dissolution of the body and the resurrection to which we allude;" and then, after quoting some scripture, and urging some reasons (neither of which as I humbly conceive is in point as regards my objections) you then say, "we therefore infer that the *positive* rewards of virtue, and the punishments of vice, are allotted to the experience of this life. After this you say, "there may, and probably will be a great disproportion in the measure of enjoyment, during the intermediate period between the dissolution of the body, and the resurrection to immortality," &c. This, sir, *appears to me* to be illogical reasoning. Now it remains for you to prove the intermediate state spoken of, and admitting that you can prove such a state, pray, sir, be so good as to inform me what can be the design of this state, since you infer that "the *positive* rewards of virtue, and the punishments of vice, are allotted to the experience of this life." It is true that you admit, that "there may, and probably will be a great disproportion, in the measure of enjoyment, during the intermediate period, between the dissolution of the body, and the resurrection to immortality." Now, admitting this to be the case, the question naturally arises, is not this accusing the Deity with partiality, providing all do not experience the same degree of enjoyment in the state alluded to, since you infer, that "the *positive* rewards of virtue, and the punishments of vice, are both allotted to the experience of this life?" I leave this difficulty, sir, with you to solve. Admitting the intermediate state alluded to, to be true, and that in that state, the whole human family are to be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body, such a scheme, I must confess, would appear rational, and would bear the stamp of impartiality; but the idea of promising enjoyment, as a punishment for sin, is, I must confess, beyond my comprehension. It is true, that you make a distinction in the degree of enjoyment, but I think you will admit, that where there is any enjoyment, misery cannot exist: this idea appears to me to be repugnant to both scripture and reason; for we have the strongest proof, both in the Old and New Testaments, that impenitent sinners will be punished: and would it not be taking away the force of those threatenings entirely, to tell sinners at the same time, that their punishment will consist of enjoyment? This difficulty I shall also leave with you to reconcile.

ZENITH.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

The Editor expects to preach at Chepachet on Sabbath, the 31st instant.

REPLY TO "ZENITH."

Our correspondent has addressed us a second time upon the subject of *future punishment*, supposing that we either *mistook* his meaning, or that we were *unable* to answer his reasons.

We did not mistake his meaning in a former communication, nor are we conscious of having failed to meet his reasons on fair and honourable ground. It is true, he professes not to be satisfied with the answer we gave; but that is rather a misfortune than a fault of ours. We should, indeed, be happy to afford him entire satisfaction on this subject; but in case we do not, it must not be imputed to any want of desire on our part. Were we not acquainted with the nature of human prejudice, in some degree, and had seen it often yield to the force of evidence, we should give up the attempt as fruitless; for ZENITH apprises us in the onset, that he does not expect any *satisfactory proof* to be adduced on this subject.—What kind of proof he would expect in order to have it satisfactory, we are unable to determine; but we can lay before him such evidence as is convincing to our minds. This we shall do when we come to that part of the communication in which ZENITH urges his objections to the doctrine we have endeavoured to maintain.

It is necessary to notice a few complaints which our correspondent has indulged, respecting the manner in which we disposed of his argument upon the *rain and sunshine*, and the *resurrection to a state of immortality*, &c. He complains that we mistook his meaning: it may be so—but we did not mistake his language; and if his language did not convey his meaning, this was his misfortune, and not our fault. We are willing, however, that ZENITH should explain his own meaning; and then to meet him on the ground of his choice. If we now understand the reasoning of our correspondent, his meaning is this. There is a great disparity in the conduct of men in this world, as to *virtue and vice*; yet they enjoy in common, the blessings of sunshine and rain: and does not this prove that they are not dealt with according to their respective deserts? And if there should be no distinction made in the eternal world, at the resurrection to immortality, would it not prove that God is partial, both in this world, and in the eternal state? We have been particular in stating this question of our correspondent, so as to render it perfectly plain to the comprehension of all our readers; and we will endeavour to be equally explicit in our reply.

We begin the answer, by saying, that the blessings of *sunshine and rain* are not the rewards of the righteous in this world; and therefore, are blessings wholly unmerited, or bestowed by the free favour of God, expressive of the equal and impartial goodness of his own nature. These blessings could not be withheld as a punishment to the wicked, without involving the righteous in the same calamity; or to use the language of inspiration, without "punishing the righteous with the wicked;" which would be unjust or cruel—for "it is not good to punish the just." Nor have they ever been withholden from any people, but to the discomfiture of a whole nation, or country. In such cases they have sometimes been viewed in the light of a punishment, or nation-

al scourge, for national offences. But in the ordinary course of Providence, they are extended to all men—*sinners*, as well as *saints*. This can only be accounted for by the fact, that they are wholly unmerited by the actions of men. The punishments of vice must therefore be predicated upon different principles.

Sin is a *moral* offence, and must therefore receive a punishment according to its nature. As the offence is *mental*, or of the *mind*, its punishment must be of a nature corresponding with the character of the offence. Hence we read, that "the wicked are like the troubled sea when his waters cannot rest. There is no peace to the wicked, saith my God. The way of transgressors is hard."

Again: *sin* is a *personal* offence: and if so, its punishment must also be personal. For it is written, "The son shall not bear the iniquities of the father."

These examples are sufficient to show the correctness of our first position, namely: that the common blessings of *sunshine and rain*, are not bestowed as the reward of merit, but are the spontaneous and impartial diffusion of divine goodness; and that a different manifestation would not be compatible with the equity of his moral government.

In our reply to ZENITH's first communication, we simply stated, what we think has never been disputed by any theologian; that the blessings of a resurrection to immortality and eternal happiness in a future world, were not the *reward* of human merit, but the gift of God, and wholly the work of grace. As no evidence has yet been exhibited, or even attempted, to show the incorrectness of this theory, we are left to conclude that our opponent admits their validity. But we are able to do more—for we consider the evidence of the apostles' words, of sufficient authority to prove that the happiness of the saints cannot be brought to the highest state of perfection, until the whole intelligent creation is liberated from the bondage of sin and death, and brought into the liberty of the children of God.

St. Paul mentions a venerable catalogue of the ancient worthies, whose piety had rendered their names conspicuous in the pages of the Hebrew scriptures, of whom he affirms, "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."—Hebrews, xi. 39, 40. Here we are instructed that the *PROPHETS* and *PATRIARCHS*, who have gone before, were not made perfect, as late as the days of the apostles: and that they could not be rendered perfect without the apostles. Our readers may find a corresponding testimony in Rev. vi. 9, 10, 11.—"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar, the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." These evidences prove with

sufficient clearness, that the departed saints had not arrived at their full portion of enjoyment, so late as when the last book containing the facts of inspiration, was written.

Having shown that the ancient saints could not be perfected in bliss without the apostles and primitive christians, we have the evidence directly before us, of an intermediate state, between the dissolution of the body, and the final perfection and glory of these worthies.

If we can now prove that the apostles did not expect the consummation of their happiness until the whole creation should be restored, the fact of an intermediate state will not only be strengthened, but the truth of the resurrection of the whole human race to a state of immortality and eternal glory, will appear inseparably connected with the highest perfection of the saints' enjoyment. This we shall endeavour to prove by irrefragible testimony, in our next number.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

To the Editor of the Christian Telescope.

SIR—I have noticed with peculiar emotions, the inattention of multitudes to the duties of public worship, and their strong propensity to spend their Sabbaths at places of amusement, and in frequent excursions out of town. If you approve the sentiments of the subjoined remarks, you will oblige a constant reader of your paper by giving them an insertion.

"Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is."

No duty is more plainly inculcated, both by precept and example, in the history of the apostles and early disciples of Christ, than that which is enjoined in the sentence which stands at the head of this article. Yet no duty is more frequently passed unheeded than this. The cares of a family are not unfrequently urged to palliate the total neglect of attention to this moral obligation: when at the same time, a party of pleasure, or some insignificant amusement would keep them from their families, and from their domestic concerns twice the length of time that they would be detained by a regular attendance on public worship.

But, pray what are the great concerns of the family, or domestic circle, which prevents the whole family from attending the duties of the sanctuary, one day in seven? Or rather *three hours* out of *ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHT*? Is it pretended that the business of ordinary life is urgent, which prevents an attendance? This is only an attempt to excuse one offence by the commission of another! For it is obvious to all, that to calculate, and lay out business beforehand for the Sabbath, is an offence against the good order, morals, and laws of society: and that all such innovations are a transgression of the divine rule, which saith, "be subject to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake." But is it necessary to devote the Sabbath to the ordinary business of life? The wisdom of all ages has determined that one seventh part of the time ought to be devoted to relaxation from the labours and cares of life, to invigorate the constitution,

both of the body and the mind. Besides the wise decision of antique ages, the scriptures of inspiration enjoin it as a duty to devote one day in seven to rest, and the duties of the sanctuary. It is true, that prudence and necessity often detain one or two of a family, while the rest are attending on public worship. But this is very different from a whole family's vacating their seats from Sabbath to Sabbath.

After all, we have not explained the true reason or reasons of this neglect. Two motives, of a very opposite nature, operate on the minds of men to produce this indifference to the social and religious duty under consideration. The *first*, is that love of empty and vain amusement, which the multitude so fondly cherish, without any proper regard to morals, or even expense. We say, without a proper regard to morals—for whoever would *plan* and *execute* an excursion of pleasure or amusement on the Sabbath, will not have the effrontery to plead that he does it to promote morality, or good order in society: For the experience and common observation of every reflecting man, prove that these objects are not promoted, but greatly retarded by such a procedure.—For the momentary gratification of the immoral propensity we are considering, an unnecessary expense is frequently incurred, and an unwarrantable prodigality is thereby encouraged. The influence of such examples, is highly injurious to the morals of society, and especially to those of the rising generation.—That *Heads* of families should furnish their children with examples so pernicious, is indeed much to be lamented; and strongly indicates a thoughtless apathy: or something worse—a criminal indifference to their respectability, their morals, and their general welfare and happiness! Those, therefore, who wish to be useful to society, to be considered as entitled to respect, and to afford an example to their children in which they would feel themselves honoured to be imitated, are invited to reflect on the course they adopt; and decide for themselves on the natural and unavoidable influence of their own conduct. For the moment of bitter reflection will come; nay, the days of unavailing regret, that they have taught their children, by example, to trample upon the sacred authority of the gospel, which saith, "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is."

The *second* reason for the neglect of attendance on public worship, grows out of a disgraceful indolence, altogether unnatural; and which is entirely the creature of habit. Tell such, that laziness prevents their attendance, and they would resent it as an insult: Accuse them of entire thoughtlessness, and they will reject you as presumptuous; but charge them with hostility to the morals of society, and the interests of revealed religion, and they will affect to be wounded at your great want of charity! Then let all such delinquents examine themselves, and decide upon the true motives of their negligence: Let them ask themselves whether they are the true friends of the Saviour, who said, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." And again—"He that is not with me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad."

A Lover of Good Order.

MORALIST, NO. 7.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

The certainty of a dissolution of organic nature, is acknowledged by all who possess intelligence. No fact of which we have any knowledge, is more strongly authenticated. The history of all ages, and our own observation, testifies the entire extinction of corporeal existence, and evinces that *all flesh is as grass, and the glory thereof as the flower of the field!* Here let us pause, and at the shrine of reflection, indulge in serious meditation, our wandering thoughts. Life's transient taper, though luminous at first, must soon grow dim. The comet's blaze, as swift he takes his destined flight through the unmeasured fields of ether, illumines the aerial arch; but when his course is finished, all again is shrouded in the sable curtains of night. So life's evaporating fluid quickens and animates the dust with one effulgent flash, and all is dust again! How short the stay of man on earth! His life is scarce commenced when, lo! he has approached the bounds which he cannot pass! If his head is wintered o'er with years, he looks back upon the day he has past, as upon the vision of a fleeting night, inclined to doubt the evidence of his senses! Thus man is but the being of a day. His sun rises in the morning—he gains his zenith at noon and at evening is set for ever! This view of life prompts the most tender sympathies and corrosive reflections, and inspires the inquiry—*our fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live for ever?* They have long ago realized the sentence of the great Jehovah, *dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.* Reason and observation are continually reminding us of the all-important and interesting truth that teaches us we have here no continuing city. In every page of nature's book, we discover the proofs of dissolution and decay, and read our own inevitable destiny. Life is but a brittle thread: It is but a prelude to eternity, from which nothing separates us but the dreaded isthmus—*DEATH!* That isthmus all must pass who taste of joys immortal, or gain the hallowed courts of heaven's eternal King! How ought these reflections upon the shortness of life and the certainty of death, to arouse us to the important consideration of our own feebleness, our liability to decay, and the futility of all earthly connexions and enjoyments. How ought we, as rational beings, in consideration of our approaching departure from the abodes of time, of our entrance into the gates of death, and of our embarkation upon the ocean of eternity, to improve with all diligence every fleeting moment in preparation for so distinguishing and important a voyage.

It is a voyage which all must perform, sooner or later, whether prepared or unprepared. How necessary and all-important then that we have our lamps trimmed and burning, that when we are summoned to depart from the shores of time, we may go on our way rejoicing. Thus adorned and armed with *faith, hope and charity*, and every christian grace and virtue, we shall in triumph pass through the struggles of death; and with palms of victory and crowns of immortal glory, wafted by the gentle gales of love

divine, sail upon the unruffled bosom of eternity's boundless ocean!

Unwise indeed, must that man be, who remains inactive while there is so much to be attended to, and so short a time allotted for its accomplishment. Man is sure of no time but the present. The time that has passed, will never return; and the future is wrapt in a cloud of awful uncertainty and obscurity: Those years, and months, and weeks, and days, which we have realized, and which perhaps have been spent in idle gaiety, or squandered away in thoughtless unconcern, are but as the baseless dream on fancy's airy pillow. They in one sense are as though they never had been: we may indeed recollect them, and the events which characterized their fleeting periods, but it is only recollection: They, with the years before the flood, have for ever flown, and are shrouded in eternal oblivion!

Robb'd of the past, the future yet unknown!
The present moment only is our own!

Nor are we sure of that present long: Our moments fly with the rapidity of lightning: the same moment closes our being here, and opens upon the dread scenes of eternity. Our yesterdays and to-morrows exist only in recollection and anticipation. Yesterday man was not: to-day is; and to-morrow is not. He is like the vapour which rises in the morning and floats about in ether, is condensed and mingled with its original at evening—He comes forth in the morn, is driven and tossed in the whirlwind of passion, agitated and racked with disease; and at evening is absorbed in dissolution, and mingled with his native dust.

Think not then, O man! to say within thyself, *my mountain stands strong, I shall not be removed*, when thou knowest not but the next moment thou wilt fall from life's precarious precipice, into the unfathomable abyss of a boundless eternity! And say not to thy soul, soul, take thine ease, when there is so much that ought to interest it, and excite its powers to zealous activity in piety and holiness. "Boast not thyself of to-morrow, for thou knowest not what a day or an hour may bring forth."

ORIGINAL POETRY.

ISRAEL'S DELIVERANCE.

When Israel's hosts had safely march'd,
Where floods on heaps were stay'd;
And saw the mountain's foaming arch,
Rush on their foes dismay'd;

They rais'd their voice in songs of praise,
For great deliv'rance wrought;
And mingled with their ardent lays,
The gratitude of thought.

Their fears were hush'd, their freedom gain'd,
And galling bondage pass'd;
While shouts of joy their mirth proclaim'd,
And bade their triumph last.

They sped their way from desert wilds,
Through Jordan's swelling tide;
While Canaan's fertile plains, in smiles,
Their ev'ry want supplied.

Here plenty crown'd their lives with good,
And freedom bless'd their store;
And here, Devotion's altar stood,
Unstain'd with human gore.

D.

SELECTIONS.

ADVICE TO FEMALES.—No. 3.

Applaud not on slight acquaintance; be not over hasty in thy commendations.

For the deed that speaketh for thy sister, may not be owing to a deserving motive; nor the words of of her mouth proceed from the sincerity of her heart.

By giving *applause* rashly, thou mayest be reduced to recal thy opinion; and thy praises hereafter will not avail thy deserving friend.

Commend not thyself with thy lips; but let thine actions speak in thy behalf.

Yet the merit of thy deeds may be lost in ostentation, and she that seeketh praise, will be disappointed therein.

Also, if thou disclaimest the eulogiums to which thou art fully entitled, they shall be justly taken from thee again.

For she who affecteth to despise commendation, shall not enjoy the privilege thereof.

Be not exalted, though all men commend thee; for thou knowest not but the breath of a whisper may convert their eulogies into revilings.

Give not applause to another, because she bestoweth upon thee; lest the world detect thy motive, and thy words be held in derision.

Dost thou commend another for virtues more conspicuous in thyself, take heed lest thou art a trumpeter of thine own deservings.

Be not too cold in thy general applause, yet utter not thy praise without due deliberation.

Praise not a woman to the skies, for her most consummate perfection is inferior to the angels'.

Thy friend will not thank thee for the extravagance of thy praise; for undeserved commendation is the *severest satire*.

We have often wondered how it is possible for a physician, who sees in the human frame so many wonderful marks, not only of design, but of wisdom, power and goodness, and who is so often reminded of the transitory nature of earthly existence, can help being deeply impressed with a sense of religious obligation. The ingenious arrangement and the exact balance of the various muscles—the inscrutable operations which are constantly going on in the stomach and alimentary canal—the heart and arteries impelling the vital fluid to every part of the body, and the veins accompanying the arteries to receive the reflux blood, and convey it back to the heart—the brain deriving nervous power from the blood thrown to it by the heart, and the heart continuing its motion by the nervous influence which it derives from the brain—all proclaim, in a language no infidel can resist, the existence and wisdom of the great Designer. Surely, it seems to us, "an undevout anatomist is mad."

There are only two things in which the false professors of all religions have agreed; to persecute all other sects, and to plunder their own.

MARRIED,

In this town, on Sunday evening last, by President Messer, Hon. Samuel Eddy, member of Congress, to Mrs. Sarah H. Dwight, daughter of the late Hon. David Howell.

On Monday evening last, by Rev. Mr. Wilson, Mr. John G. Quarman, to Miss Emma-Ann Richmond.

On Sunday evening last, by Rev. Mr. Ludlow, Capt. John Davis, of East-Greenwich, to Miss Eunice Hammond Shaw, of this town.

DIED,

In this town, on Monday evening last, Mrs. Elizabeth Searle, relict of the late Capt. James Searle, of East-Greenwich, in her 79th year.

Same evening, Mrs. Judith Pearson, wife of Col. Samuel Pearson, in the 54th year of her age.

On Tuesday last, Elizabeth Arnold, infant daughter of Mr. Wm. A. Howard, aged 17 months.

In Woodstock (Con.) on Thursday last, Mrs. Clarissa Wilkinson, wife of Mr. Rhodes Wilkinson, aged about 60 years.

The subscribers for the TELESCOPE who are desirous to have their papers at \$1.50 per the volume, are reminded that the pay must be forwarded by the 30th instant, at which time the *first quarter* closes.

New subscribers for the TELESCOPE can have the numbers from the commencement of the volume, at \$1.50 per year, by paying the same within three months from the time of subscribing.

The 5th No. of the Public Discussion, between Rev. Mr. McCalla and Rev. Mr. Kneeland is received, and may be had by applying to Samuel W. Wheeler, Westminster-Street, or at this office.

SERMONS.

The two Discourses delivered by the Editor, at Medway, Mass. are ready for delivery. Price, 20 cts.

PRINTING.

The subscriber would inform the publick, that he is prepared to receive orders for the different kinds of printing, which will be executed with entirely new materials, and at the lowest prices. Having had a long experience in the business, and as he intends to pay particular and personal attention to it, he flatters himself that he shall receive a share of publick patronage. He is constantly receiving additions to his office, which he hopes soon to have supplied with every article necessary to enable him to carry on the business on an extensive scale. No pains nor expense will be spared to procure such materials as will suit his customers. B. CRANSTON.

NO. 110½, WESTMINSTER-STREET.

The following Books and Pamphlets may be had by applying as above:

Kneeland's Translation of the New Testament,	1 50
Do. Lectures on Universal Benevolence,	75
Ballou's Treatise on Atonement,	1 00
Letters between Rev. Mr. Buckminster, Rev. Mr. Walton, and Rev. Mr. Ballou,	25
Hymn Books used at the Universalist Chapel in this town,	75
Scriptural Catechism,	06
Mystery of Revelation Unfolded, in two Discourses, on Rev. xx. 10th and 12th v.	20
Force of Prejudice,	20
Kneeland's Sermon on Psalm ix. 17, with an account of Ancient Copies of the Bible,	20
With a variety of Discourses on various subjects.	

SAMUEL W. WHEELER.